

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In this amendment, claims 1, 6 and 11 are amended. Support can be found in Fig. 3 and its relevant descriptions. No new matter is introduced. Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-13, 15-17 under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kawase et al. (US Patent No. 6,651,082). The Office Action rejected claim 14 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawase et al. (US Patent No. 6,651,082; hereinafter “Kawase”) in view of Kloth (US Patent No. 6,549,961; hereinafter “Kloth”). The Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner for the following reasons.

Kawase fails to teach or suggest **selectively** allocating said graphics data to **either** said central processing unit **or** said transformation/lighting engine of said graphics processor according to said utilization rate of said central processing unit, as recited in claim 1; allocating said vertex data to said central processing unit **rather than said transformation/lighting engine of said graphics processor** when said utilization rate of said central processing unit is less than a second threshold value, as recited in claim 6; and a path selection unit **selectively** allocating said graphics data to **either** said central processing unit **or** transformation/lighting engine of said graphics processor according to a utilization rate of said central processing unit, as recited in claim 11.

On the contrary, please refer to Kawase, in col. 5, lines 47-57 “Host processor 21 handles processes ... and writes the results to command queue 25a via memory controller 23 [and] memory controller 23 transmits data from command queue 25a to graphics adapter 29 via bus 27 per predetermined size”; in col. 2, lines 4-12 “If the command queue is full, the host processor cannot write to the command queue any more, therefore it cannot go on to processing until there is a space in it. Also, if the command queue is empty, the graphics adapter cannot perform processing”; and in col. 2, lines 52-63, the objects. It is apparent that Kawase’s data is **sequentially** transmitted from host processor 21 to graphics adapter 29, other than selectively transmitted to either host processor 21 to graphics adapter 29. If graphics processor 29 processes faster than host processor 21, command queue 25a will become empty, while command queue 25a will become full if graphics processor 29 processes slower than host processor 21. Both are

adverse to the system's performance. That's why load balance is required. Therefore, persons having ordinary skill in the art understand that the present invention is not anticipated by Kawase and there is no common issue concerned between the cited reference and the present invention.

Since the rejection over Kawase has been traversed, the rejection over Kawase in view of Kloth is deemed to be moot.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 6, 11, and claims 2-5, 7-10 and 12-17 which respectively dependent therefrom, are novel and unobvious over the cited references. Allowance of all pending claims 1-17 is respectfully requested.

Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If there are any remaining issues preventing allowance of the pending claims that may be clarified by telephone, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

/Evan R. Witt/

Evan R. Witt
Reg. No. 32,512
Attorney for Applicant(s)

Date: October 10, 2007
KIRTON & McCONKIE
1800 Eagle Gate Tower
60 East South Temple
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111
Telephone: 801/328-3600

<p>The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0843.</p>
